DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 193 426 CE 026 175

AUTHOR Carlson, Anne; And Others
TITLE Private Sector Involvement Project. Phase 1. Needs Assessment. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Chandler/Corcoran, Inc., Seattle, Wash.
SPONS AGENCY Washington State Dept. of Employment Security, Olympia.
PUB DATE Mar 80
NOTE 77p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Business; *Employer Attitudes; Employers; *Employment Counselors; Employment Programs; *Employment Services; Federal Programs; Industry; Job Applicants; Job Development; *Job Placement; Needs Assessment; Public Agencies; State Federal Aid; State Surveys; Unemployment
IDENTIFIERS *Comprehensive Employment and Training Act; Government Industry Relationship; Private Sector Involvement Project; *Washington

ABSTRACT

More than half of 250 employers surveyed in Washington had little or no knowledge of government employment-incentive programs; among those who did know of the programs there was a somewhat positive base of opinion, but there were many strong and vocal critics. The survey was the needs assessment phase of the Private Sector Involvement Project, a Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) funded program to increase the number of private sector jobs available to unemployed persons. The survey also showed that employers want job developers (government placement personnel) who contact them to be better trained, to cooperate among themselves, and to use better written information. Collateral data from the public placement agencies disclosed that job developers want more understanding of private industry, and training in communication techniques, job development, and labor market analysis, and more communication with employers. Additional survey findings were that many job applicants sent to employers were unqualified, and that more small than large businesses found the agency services unsatisfactory or nonexistent. Appendixes include the survey instrument, a list of personal interviews, preview of phases II and III of the project, employer comments, and summaries of surveys by the National Alliance of Business and the National Chamber of Commerce. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED193426

PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVEMENT PROJECT

PHASE I

NEEDS ASSESSMENT

Final Report

Anne Carlson
Rod Chandler
George Corcoran

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CHANDLER/CORCORAN, Inc.

1625 Boylston Avenue
Seattle, WA 98122
(206) 323-9384

March 1980

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

K. Wendy Holden

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE 026 175

PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVEMENT PROJECT

PHASE I: NEEDS ASSESSMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	i
PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVEMENT PROJECT	1
PHASE I - PRELIMINARY REPORT	
Section I - Summary	3
Section II - Methodology	6
A. Survey Forms	6
B. Sampling Techniques	7
Section III - Survey Findings and Analysis	12
A. Statistics	12
B. Summary of Findings	13
C. Detailed Results and Analysis of Findings	14
1. Private Sector Survey Results	15
2. Public/Private Non-Profit Sector Survey Results	22
Section IV - General Discussion	27
A. Common Issues	27
B. Private Sector Issues	31
C. Public Sector Issues	33
Section V - Recommendations	35
A. Recommendations for Public Information Campaign and Training Sessions	35
B. General Recommendations ("Good Ideas")	37

APPENDICES
- A: Private Sector Survey and Results
- B: Public Sector Survey and Results
- C: List of Personal Interviews in Addition to Survey
- D: Private Sector Involvement Project, Phases II and III
- E: Employer Comments
- F: Summary, National Alliance of Business Survey
- G: Summary and Conclusions, National Chamber of Commerce Survey

INTRODUCTION

Full employment has been a national goal since the Great Depression. Over the years a number of programs have been developed at the federal level to assist people to become gainfully employed. The most recent, and by far the largest, is the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) established in 1973 to provide training, employment and other employment-related services to unemployed, underemployed, and economically, disadvantaged persons.

During the five years CETA has been in operation, its budget has increased from $1.5 billion in 1974 to approximately $10.3 billion in 1979. The majority of this money is spent on the two major approaches used under CETA to get people employed: (1) public service employment (PSE): CETA money is provided to fund salaries for people to work in cities, towns, school districts, county government and other governmental agencies. In addition, private non-profit agencies may hire people who meet CETA eligibility requirements using PSE funds. And, (2) training: CETA funds pay for tuition, fees, or subsidized salaries for specific skills training, classroom training (including vocational and basic academic education) and on-the-job training.

CETA monies have been used to employ people directly in the public sector or to prepare them for employment. The great preponderance of CETA money (76% in 1979) has been paid to employ people in public service jobs with the hopes that they will be hired on a permanent basis once their CETA eligibility expires; or that they will have obtained the work experience or skills necessary to find another job. Historically, public service employment has been the method used, through CETA, to reduce unemployment. Little attention has been paid to involving the private sector.

That is beginning to change. Several new developments within CETA are causing a re-assessment of the relationship with private

employers and a more aggressive attempt is being made to involve private employers in CETA efforts.

For one thing, CETA eligibility requirements are being tightened and the length of time a person may remain on CETA funds has been reduced and enforced. Previously, a person might remain in a CETA-funded job for several years or move from one CETA-funded position to another. Now, at the end of 18 months, they are terminated unless the budget of the agency is revised to retain them. Therefore, more attention is being given to helping that person get another job. In Tacoma, for example, as a person nears the end of his CETA PSE term, a Job Club provides an intensive course in how to find another job.

Second, CETA's emphasis on public service employment is under scrutiny. There have been many charges of abuse and political patronage hiring. In addition, after five years some government entities are becoming saturated. Municipal unions are objecting to CETA's low pay scale and some municipalities or other public employers don't need or can't absorb more employees. Although PSE remains a major element of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act, these pressures encourage more attention toward private industry.

Third, when CETA was revised in 1978, a new Title VII was added, the Private Sector Initiative Program, which set aside money for programs to be planned and implemented by new Private Industry Councils. These Councils are composed of a majority of business people and include other representatives from labor, the community and education. Title VII, though small in its initial allocation, is important in establishing a new CETA direction. Under the new concept, these employer committees will help to shape employment and training programs.

PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVEMENT PROJECT

In the state of Washington, the state Prime Sponsor, acting under the guidance of the Employment and Training Council, established the Private Sector Involvement Project. The project, designed to increase the number of private sector jobs available to unemployed people who are seeking employment, is funded under the Governor's Comprehensive Employment and Training Act 4% Discretionary Grant monies.

As outlined in the Request for Proposal, the project was developed to address the following statement of need:

> The private sector is an excellent source of jobs, providing five out of every six new jobs in our economy. Because of the changing economy and labor market conditions which have created these jobs, traditional public employment and training programs can only meet their goal of assisting the economically disadvantaged who are unemployed by working more closely with private employers.
>
> At the same time, by working closely with the public sector, the private sector employer has the advantage of access to trained employees, reimbursement for on-the-job training, and eligibility for tax reductions, among other benefits. A close working relationship between the public and private sector can, therefore, be mutually beneficial.

This project aims to accomplish its purpose of increasing the number of private sector jobs for the unemployed by: (1) improving the quality of contacts between public/private non-profit job placement agencies and private sector employers and (2) by developing creative methods to inform private employers of the benefits to employment and training incentive programs.

In July, 1979, Chandler/Corcoran, Inc., a private management consulting and communications firm, was retained by the Employment and Training Division of Employment Security to undertake the Private Sector Involvement Project. Principals in the firm are George Corcoran, Project Manager; Rod Chandler, Associate Project Manager; and Anne Carlson, Associate Project Manager.

Specifically, the project has three phases. The first phase, described in this report, has been a needs assessment to determine how best to improve communication between private employers and public/private non-profit placement agencies. The second and third phases will use information gained in Phase One to develop a public information campaign directed to private employers and to provide training for job developers.

The report that follows includes a detailed description of the surveys which Chandler/Corcoran carried out as the primary activity of the first phase of the Private Sector Involvement Project. The purpose of these surveys has been to assess relationships between private employers and job developers, from the perspective of both, and to determine the needs for improved communication and training.

In addition to the survey described in this report, two other recent surveys are of interest. The National Chamber of Commerce published a study in the fall of 1978 which provided information on three areas; namely: (1) the use by business of federal employment and training programs and the types of positions they fill when using them; (2) employers' assessment of federal employment and training programs; and, (3) recommendations for future governmental programs.

In the spring of 1979, the National Alliance of Business conducted a survey to examine employers' receptivity to the new Private Sector Initiative Program (Title VII of CETA).

Summaries of the conclusion of these reports are reproduced in the Appendix. The addresses of both organizations are included in order to enable the reader to write for a copy of the entire report.

The ensuing report on Phase One of the Private Sector Involvement Project contains survey findings and analyses, a discussion of issues, and recommendations for future activities.

CC*I
chandler/corcoran inc.
1625 BOYLSTON AVENUE • SEATTLE, WA 98122 • 323-9881

PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVEMENT PROJECT

PHASE I

NEEDS ASSESSMENT
Final Report

SECTION I

SUMMARY

The Private Sector Involvement Project was established to increase the number of private sector jobs available to the unemployed person. It seeks to do this by: (1) improving the quality of contacts between public placement staff and private sector employers; and (2) developing improved and innovative methods of informing employers of the benefits of employment and training programs. The project is funded under the Governor's Comprehensive Employment and Training Act 4% Discretionary Grant monies. Project activities are carried out by Chandler/Corcoran, Inc., a private management consulting and communications firm, under the direction of the Employment and Training Division of Employment Security.

This section summarizes the results from a statewide survey of private employers and public/private non-profit placement agency staff to determine how best to improve communication between them.

The survey aimed at assessing job developer/employer relationships, determining employers' familiarity with the public employment incentive programs, and soliciting suggestions for improvement. More than 250 interviews were completed in seven major geographic areas around the state. Approximately one-fourth of these were personal interviews; the rest were completed by mail or phone. Both large (more than 100 employees) and small (fewer than 100 employees) businesses were surveyed, as well as both public and private non-profit placement agencies.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The following represent general and summarized conclusions, the bases for which are contained in the survey results.

1. Private Sector Employer Findings

   a. Relationship with Job Development Activities

      There is a somewhat positive base of opinion among private employers regarding public placement activities. However,

there are many strong and vocal critics and much improvement is desirable.

b. Familiarity with Public Incentive Programs

More than half of the employers responding have little or no familiarity with government employment incentive programs. Those that have some knowledge gained it from written information, job developers, and professional contacts (in that order).

c. Suggestions for Improvement

Employers want job developers to be better trained (more aware of business needs and more effective in carrying out their responsibilities); to be working in a more coordinated way with each other; and to be using better written information.

2. Public/Private Non-Profit Agency Findings

a. Job Developer Activities and Training

Job developers receive little or no formal training concerning the private sector, although they bear primary responsibility for these contacts. There is little effective coordination of their activities.

b. Communication with Employers

Written materials provided to employers are generally developed by the agency or its "parent" at the state or federal level. Agency personnel generally have a narrow view of their role in the community.

c. Suggestions for Improvement and Training

Placement agency staff want more understanding of the workings of private industry and training in communication techniques, job development, and labor market analysis. They would like more opportunities to communicate with employers.

SELECTED DETAIL OF ADDITIONAL FINDINGS

1. How many job developers do employers see and is it too many?

The average response ranged from 2-5 and most employers consider the number about right or too few. Effective contacts with job developers, particularly when employers received assistance with affirmative action requirements, were appreciated.

2. How do employers rate the level of service from public agencies?

More than half of both the large and small businesses responding to this question felt they were receiving adequate to good service from

job developers. Sixty percent of the large businesses responding (and 48% of the small) rated the general level of communications between public and private sectors in their community as "generally satisfactory," (50%-44%) to "very good" (11%-4%).

More small businesses (52%) feel communications are unsatisfactory to nonexistent, probably because they have had no contact from placement agencies, or they haven't the time (no personnel manager) nor the inclination to seek the agencies out.

In general, employers would like to see agencies coordinate their efforts more effectively and play a stronger role in their efforts to place the unemployed person in private sector jobs.

3. How do employers rate the quality of applicants referred by public/private non-profit agencies?

   Considerable dissatisfaction was expressed by employers regarding screening of applicants referred to them. Three-fourths of the respondents said applicants were only occasionally screened and qualified or were neither screened nor qualified.

4. What improvements would employers recommend to make private non-profit and public agencies more effective?

   The recommendations can be summarized as (1) better training for job developers; (2) coordination of placement activities; (3) better written information; and (4) procedural improvements.

5. What kind of training and information would job developers like to receive?

   Training requests included (1) job development skills; (2) salesmanship techniques; (3) private sector information; and (4) labor market information.

6. Are job development activities coordinated?

   Although agencies report they do coordinate placement activities, effective coordination appears to be minimal.

In general, finds indicate that public employment and training programs have a modest base of support among private employers. Considerable work needs to be done to improve present services and communications, particularly in relation to small business.

SECTION II

METHODOLOGY

The aim of the Private Sector Involvement Project is to improve the quality of contacts and communications between public/private non-profit job placement agency staff and private employers. In order to base activities for improvement on actual needs, Chandler/Corcoran conducted a statewide survey of private employers and placement personnel. This section describes the mechanics of developing the survey.

A. SURVEY FORMS

Two parallel survey forms were developed, one directed at private employers and the other for use with public/private non-profit job placement agencies.

1. Purpose

The questionnaire for private employers was developed to:

a. assess their relationship with job development activities in their communities;

b. determine their familiarity with the public incentive programs that encourage them to hire the unemployed; and,

c. solicit suggestions for improvement.

The questionnaire directed to public/private non-profit job placement agencies was designed to:

a. assess job developer activities and training;

b. describe methods of communication used by job developers with employers; and,

c. solicit suggestions for improvement and training.

Both questionnaires were designed to provide information on which to base an information campaign for employers and a series of training sessions for job developers. The questionnaires sought both facts and opinions.

2. Validation

To assure that the questionnaires were appropriate for their respective audiences and that they would produce useful information, several steps were taken:

a. two draft questionnaires were developed.

b. the drafts were "field tested" with a group of eight employers and four representatives of public/private non-profit job placement agencies respectively.

2. Validation continued

c. the drafts were submitted to the Employment and Training Division of Employment Security for comment.

d. the drafts were discussed in detail with a professional researcher from the University of Washington.

Following these discussions, a final version of each questionnaire was prepared and submitted to Employment Security for final approval. The private sector questionnaire was modified again before being mailed to simplify a few questions and to adjust the order of the questions. These modifications were deemed wise following its use in a number of personal interviews.

B. SAMPLING TECHNIQUES

To provide a representative sample of responses from private employers, the surveys were conducted in seven geographic areas of the state with four categories of business, both large and small. In each of these areas a variety of public and private non-profit agencies were also surveyed.

1. Geography

Through discussions with the project manager at Employment Security, seven major labor market areas were identified as the geographic targets. They coincided with CETA prime sponsor areas in most cases. These included:

a. King/Snohomish

b. Kitsap

c. Tacoma

d. Vancouver

e. Yakima/Wenatchee/Ellensburg

f. Tri-Cities

g. Spokane

In addition, mail surveys were sent to employers in the balance of the state.

2. Nature and Size of Business

Four categories of businesses were sought:

a. manufacturing

b. general business

2. Nature and Size of Business continued

c. service

d. agricultural/forest products

Firms were divided according to the number of employees. Small business was defined as fewer than 100 employees, and large business, more than 100 employees.

3. Types of Public/Private Non-Profit

In each area visited an attempt was made to inverview staff in a variety of public and private non-profit agencies; for example, Employment Security Job Service Centers, personnel, CETA prime sponsors, Title III prime sponsors, and staff of private non-profit agencies serving a variety of clients (minority, handicapped, veterans, women, youth, etc.).

4. Interview Methods

In order to use time and available resources most effectively, four different sampling techniques were employed; personal interviews, mail, telephone interviews, and group discussions. Personal interviews, sometimes conducted with a group, were the chief survey method. Mail and telephone interviews were used to increase the areas covered and add breadth to the responses. All methods were used with all categories of respondents. When interviewing employers we usually talked with the person in charge of hiring (personnel manager or company head). When interviewing placement agency personnel, we talked with job developers, program managers, or agency directors.

a. Personal interviews were conducted by Anne Carlson, Rod Chandler or George Corcoran. They averaged 30-45 minutes in length with some few continuing as long as an hour and a half. Interview appointments had been previously set by a phone call. With few exceptions, both employers and agency personnel granted an interview willingly. Each interview began with a brief description of the project. The remainder of the time was then used to take the interviewee through the questionnaire with the interviewer filling out the form.

In addition, approximately 35 non-directive interviews were held with knowledgeable people to gain general information from a variety of perspectives about issues related to employment and training. These talks provided valuable background information and insights. A list of people interviewed is appended.

b. Mail Interviews

A total of 1760 private sector surveys were mailed to personnel managers or chief executive officers around the state. the following sources of names were used:

b. Mail Interviews continued

(1) Pacific Northwest Personnel Management Association, 1979 membership roster.

(2) Association of Washington Business (approximately 350 selected small businesses statewide).

(3) Seattle Chamber of Commerce membership - 260 firms.

(4) Manufacturers drawn from Wash. Mfg. Register, 1978-79, for Pierce, Clark, Kitsap, and Yakima Counties.

(5) Selected firms whose names were provided by Tacoma and Wenatchee Chambers of Commerce.

The mail surveys were sent out on September 6, 1979. 148 mail surveys were returned for a return rate of approximately 8%.

An article about the project appeared in the Pacific Northwest Personnel Management Association newsletter as well as that of the Association of Washington Business.

c. Telephone Interviews

Telephone interviews were employed after the majority of mail and personal interviews had been completed. Their use was to increase response from areas or types of business where the return had been low — Tri-Cities, Kitsap, Vancouver — and agricultural/forest product industries.

Four phoners were hired and given instructions. They were each given a goal of 15 interviews. All companies they called had been mailed a questionnaire but had not responded. Forty-six telephone surveys were successfully completed.

d. Group Discussions

In order to make time "on the road" as effective and efficient as possible, a number of employers were invited to meet over lunch (at Chandler/Corcoran's expense) to complete the survey form and then engage in a more general discussion of the issues raised. These luncheons were held in Vancouver, Yakima, Spokane, Tacoma, Everett, and Wenatchee. This was valuable both because it allowed many more contacts per location and because it allowed for an exchange among employers. In all cases, the survey form was filled out individually before general discussion ensued.

In several cases, group discussions were also held with public or private non-profit agency people. In one notable case, a dozen job developers met with Anne Carlson. The group setting gave the support necessary for bringing strong feelings and opinions out in the open. This provided good insight into some of the day-to-day problems faced by placement staff which did not always surface in an individual interview.

e. Limiting Factors

(1) Personal interview drawbacks

Personal interviews often require the interviewer to read between the lines. This is offset by conducting many interviews. Also, it is frequently more difficult in a face-to-face conversation to follow the questionnaire from beginning to end.

(2) Time

We were conducting the majority of the interviews in August and September. A sizable number of people were on vacation. Also, particularly with CETA agencies, our visits occurred during budget preparation time. In addition, it was not uncommon, especially in public agencies, to find the person with whom we were talking reasonably new to the job.

(3) Geography

Time was also a limiting factor in out-of-town interviews. We attempted to finish most areas in two person days — two people working one day or in two trips — in order to keep travel expenses to a minimum. Four or five interviews per person per day was about the maximum that could be scheduled, including travel time between interviews. In some cases, the appointment was not kept by the agency person which effectively eliminated that contact if it was out of town.

(4) Attitudes

A number of employers had had little or no contact with placement agencies. This was valuable information in itself but made for a very short interview. Also, some employers had extremely negative opinions about government employment programs or were defensive or emotional about affirmative action implications. Agency people were inclined to make their program look good/necessary. Candid answers were not always forthcoming.

(5) Other surveys

In a rare, particularly dramatic example of poor timing, we surveyed a group of employers the day after a very similar set of questions had been asked of them regarding Job Service Centers.

In the King/Snohomish area, a major mail survey was sent out at the end of August, sponsored by the King/Snohomish Manpower Consortium, the Private Industry Council, Seattle Community College District, Seattle School District, and Employment Security. We knew about this survey in advance and suffered few ill effects although one employer,

e. Limiting Factors continued

apparently exasperated, sent Chandler/Corcoran three surveys back — ours, King/Snohomish's and one from Virginia.

(6) Phone time

The number of phone calls necessary to set up each interview probably averaged four. Although we had no trouble making an appointment once we reached the person, it was extremely time-consuming to accomplish that.

Although the limiting factors caused some stress and strain, they did not have a systematic effect related to the responses.

SECTION III

SURVEY FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

First we will present statistics on the characteristics of the survey sample, then the results of the surveys will be discussed.

A. STATISTICS

1. Private Sector

a. Total number of private sector surveys completed 260

Total number more than 100 employees 151

Total number fewer than 100 employees 109

Total personal interviews 66

Total mail surveys 148

Total phone surveys 46

b. Geographic distribution: total number of employees

	more than 100	fewer than 100	total all business
King/Snohomish	73	29	102
Kitsap	5	16	21
Tacoma area	13	5	18
Spokane	14	8	22
Yakima area	11	18	29
Tri-Cities	8	2	10
Vancouver	9	11	20
Balance of State	18	20	38

1. Private Sector continued

c. Type of business: total numbers

Manufacturing	99
Service	95
General Business	46
Agricultural/Forest Products	20

2. Public Sector

a. Total number surveys completed	76
Total personal interviews	44
Total mail interviews	32

b. Geographic distribution

King/Snohomish	39
Kitsap	4
Tacoma Area	9
Tri-Cities	3
Vancouver	6
Yakima Area	11
Spokane	4

B. SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The findings presented here represent general and summarized conclusions, the bases for which are clearly contained in the survey results, but which also draw on the extensive number of conversations with employers and placement agency staff on these issues.

1. Private Sector Employer Findings

a. Relationship with Job Development Activites

There is a somewhat positive base of opinion regarding public placement activites on which to build. However, there are many strong and vocal critics and much improvement is desirable.

1. Private Sector Employer Findings continued

b. Familiarity with Public Incentive Programs

More than half of the employers responding have little or no familiarity with government employment incentive programs. Those that have some knowledge gained it from written information, job developers and professional contacts (in that order).

c. Suggestions for Improvement

Employers want job developers to be better trained (more aware of business needs and more effective in carrying out their responsibilities); to be working in a more coordinated way with each other; and to be using better written information.

2. Public/Private Non-Profit Agency Findings

a. Job developer activities and training

Job developers receive little or no formal training concerning the private sector, although they bear primary responsibility for these contacts. There is little effective coordination of their activities.

b. Communication with Employers

Written materials provided to employers are generally developed by the agency or its "parent" at the state or federal level. Agency personnel generally have a narrow view of their role in the community.

c. Suggestions for Improvement and Training

Placement agency staff want more understanding of the workings of private industry and training in communication techniques, job development, and labor market analysis. They would like more opportunities to communicate with employers.

C. DETAILED RESULTS AND ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS

In this section the significant parts of the survey will be extracted and discussed. A full tabulation of the results appears in the appendix. The numbers which follow each heading indicate its survey number. Results from both large (more than 100 employees) and small (fewer than 100 employees) businesses are presented.

It should be noted that in cases where they were asked to rate private non-profit agencies and public agencies separately, more employers responded to "public." This indicates employers'

C. DETAILED RESULTS AND ANALYSIS OF FINDINGS continued

familiarity with Employment Security as well as possible confusion about what constitutes a private non-profit agency. Note further that percentage responses are based on the number of businesses responding to that question.

Private sector survey results will be presented first, followed by public sector findings.

1. Private Sector Survey Results

1.1 What sources are used by businesses to recruit job candidates? (I.3.)

	Rank
Large (more than 100 employees)	
Newspaper advertising	1
Walk-in traffic	2
Public agencies	3
Search of applicant file	4
Small (fewer than 100 employees)	
Public agencies	1
Walk-in traffic	2
Own employees	3
Newspaper advertising	4

There is great similarity among all size businesses regarding their sources for new employees. Although large businesses are more likely to have an applicant file (this source ranked 8th by small businesses) and small businesses rely more heavily on their own employees helping to turn up job seekers (ranked 5th by large), both consider public agencies as an important source of applicants. (Private non-profit agencies, as an applicant source, rank 8th and 9th respectively in both cases.) Among the small businesses responding to this question, public agencies ranked among their top choice with "walk-in traffic" and "own employees" receiving almost equal votes. Both large and small businesses use these agency services frequently. The quality of service provided by public agencies is, therefore, very important.

1.2 How many job developers do employers see and is it too many? (II, 2, 5, 6)

In response to the question: how many different job developers do they see in a year, the numbers ranged from 0 - 22 with the most common response ranging from 2 - 5.

Most employers consider the number of job developers they see as about right or too few. The following percentages represent the response of those answering the question:

	Large	Small
too many	19%	4%
too few	38%	24%
about right	43%	71%

Although it should be noted that only 45% of small and 63% of large businesses responded to this question,* the results seem clear -- 81% of large and 95% of small businesses feel that the number of job developers they see is too few or about right. The explanation for this may be several-fold: job developers tend to work with the same businesses in a community and leave others completely untouched. Employers with whom we talked did not mind effective contacts with job developers. In fact, they often wished they would see more job developers to help with specific affirmative action needs and that applicants were more forthcoming as a result of contacts.

Many employers have some sort of regular contact with job placement agencies, with large business indicating more contacts than small. Contacts are usually initiated by the employer with over half of large business and over 60% of small business so indicating. This contact ranges from a regular listing of job openings being mailed by employers to a list of community agencies, to personnel managers personnally phoning in job orders to a number of agencies. They frequently reported disappointing responses.

When asked with whom they dealt at these agencies, most reported contacts with several different people or that they never knew with whom they would be communicating. Only one-third of large and one-fifth of small businesses reported regular contact with

*It is probably reasonable to assume that those who did not answer did not have strong feelings and would tend to support the findings.

1.2 How many job developers do employers see and is it too many? - continued

the same person. This is disturbing since most reports of satisfaction with an agency were tied to a personal relationship with a specific person with whom the employer had established trust and confidence. Job Service Centers seem to be moving away from specific people working with specific employers (account executive approach) -- a direction that might be a mistake. One manager said, practically in the same breath, that (1) employers were their life blood, (2) employers liked personal service, but (3) they were moving toward a system where everyone in the office could handle any call. This points up the problem of the efficiency of the system (the means) taking precedence over placing clients with private employers (the end).

1.3 How do employers rate the level of service received from representatives of public or private non-profit agencies? (II 3, IV, 1, 2)

	Private Non-Profit		Public	
	Large	Small	Large	Small
(1) Very good. Almost always satisfied	17%	11%	17%	13%
(2) Adequate. Generally satisfied	58%	52%	40%	40%
(3) Poor. Seldom satisfied	28%	30%	38%	41%
(4) Totally unacceptable	5%	7%	6%	6%

On this question employers were asked to consider the clarity of written material, quality of the presentation, competency of the representative, and effectiveness of follow-up.

More than half of both large businesses and small businesses responding to this question felt they were receiving adequate to good service from job developers. There is more dissatisfaction with public agencies than with private non-profit agencies. The percentage response indicating service was poor, (close to half) however, suggests there is great room for improvement.

The importance of the response to this question lies in the fact many employers do feel that placement

agencies are doing all right. The situation is not hopeless; there is a good base from which to work for improvement. And, given the extreme negativism that many employers express, it is particularly important that a group of employers are generally satisfied and that service is pretty good.

On this same subject, 61% of the large businesses responding (and 48% of small ones) rated the general level of communications between public and private sectors in their communities as "generally satisfactory" (50%/44%) to "very good" (11%/4%) respectively. More small businesses (55%) feel communications are unsatisfactory to nonexistent, probably because there is no contact from placement agencies, or they haven't the time (no personnel manager) nor the inclination (if indeed they would know who to call) to seek out the agencies. However, about half are of the opinion that the relationships are reasonably good. This should not be viewed as an argument for the status quo, but rather that the improvements can be built on a base of some acceptance.

In general, employers would like to see agencies coordinate their efforts more effectively and play a stronger role than they do now in their efforts to place the unemployed in private sector jobs. A stronger role was defined variously by employers in conversation as doing better screening, knowing employers' job needs better, sending more applicants ("we called in a job order but never had any response") and, particularly, sending applicants who were job ready -- not necessarily trained, but at least ready to work (arriving on time, staying all day, showing some interest and initiative, etc.).

As a counterpoint, it should be noted there was about equal opinion that agencies were doing the job satisfactorily and that they should get out of the placement business altogether. The specific results follow:

Concerning the efforts to place the unemployed in private sector jobs, the private non-profit and public agencies:

		Large	Small
(1)	Should play a stronger role than they do now	2	2
(2)	Are performing the assignment satisfactorily	3	4

	Large	Small
(3) Should play much less of a role than they do now	5	5
(4) Should get out of the placement business entirely	4	3
(5) Should coordinate their efforts more effectively	1	1

1.4 How do employers rate the quality of applicants referred by public/private non-profit agencies?

Responses to the question indicate a great deal of dissatisfaction with the screen of applicants referred to employers. This complaint was heard over and over -- the applicants responding to employers' job listings did not seem to have been screened by the referring agency. Approximately 75% in regard to private non-profit and 70%-80% regarding public said applicants were "occasionally well qualified and screened." Although job listings are posted and available for public view, and, therefore, agencies often cannot entirely control who responds, the matching of applicant to job description must be improved. No one is well served by poor screening -- the applicant doesn't get the job, the referring agency gets a bad mark, and the employer fails to fill a vacancy. Employers often voiced the opinion, probably with some justification, that the applicant did not want the job ("just responding as a necessity to keep his/her unemployment check"). Although this may well be true in many instances, internal improvements still need to be made. It is probably the most persistent problem with the system (and, as shown in the public sector responses, one with which public agency people are very familiar).

1.5 How familiar are employers with public incentive programs related to employment? (III 1, 5, 6, 7)

Less than half of the large businesses and only one-fourth of the small businesses indicated familiarity with programs such as OJT, Targeted Jobs Tax Credit, and CETA training programs. 43%-44% of both large and small businesses reported they were somewhat familiar and one-fifth and one-third respectively said they were not very familiar or had no knowledge of these programs. An information campaign would certainly appear to be necessary.

Most employers who do have knowledge gained it from

(1) written informational materials,

(2) personal contacts from job developers, and

(3) professional contacts.

That information has generally been well-received with three-fourths of the large businesses and over half of the small businesses stating that it was generally helpful and clear.

At the same time, as will be presented later, "better written information materials" ranks fourth as an improvement employers would suggest.

1.6 What improvements would employers recommend to make private non-profit and public agencies more effective? (IV. 3.)

	*Order of 1st choice Large	Small	*Top three All Business
(1) Upgrading of present personnel	1	4	2
(2) Selection of different personnel	7	6	7
(3) Better written information	4	3	4
(4) Improved understanding of the role of a job developer	3	1	1
(5) Better Coordination with other agencies	2	3	3
(6) Procedural/ mechanical improvements	5	5	5
(7) Better follow-up	7	3	6

*The responses to this question are presented in two ways for greater depth. The left columns represent the order of the first choices for large and small when respondents ranked in numerical order (most big businesses chose (1) as first choice; second most chose (5) as first choice, etc.). Because some did not give numerical ranking but checked those they felt important, we also tabulated the results treating ranked responses 1, 2, 3 as checks and adding them to responses which included 3 checks. The right column reflects an "all business" total of top three choices.

As can be seen, there is great similarity in the order of desired improvements between large and small business as well as the all-business total. These recommendations could be summarized as follows:

(1) Training (1), (4), (7): The need for job developers and other agency personnel to receive training and to improve their techniques as a result of training.

(2) Coordination (5): Employers want use of public resources to be more efficient and effective than they are at present. They do not want (nor have they the time) to call 10 or 15 agencies to get a variety of good applicants.

(3) Written information (3): Employers see the need for better reference material which guides them through the maze of programs and highlights those that are directed toward them. They also want to know where to turn for more information.

(4) System changes (6): Employers resent the paperwork, the red tape, and the bureaucracy involved in government programs. To be specific, the following have been mentioned:

(a) too many different contracts for different programs

(b) lack of screening of applicants

(c) lack of attention to job descriptions

(d) "Targeted Jobs Tax Credit was supposed to be easy. It took many phone calls to find out the details."

(e) "Employment Security sends me a computer print-out (or in some cases, a handwritten scrawled sheet) of all the people I have supposedly hired from them. They want detailed information on each person."

(f) One employer summed this up only partly tongue-in-cheek, "The major irritant in the day of a placement agency staff member is having to deal with an employer."

2. Public/Private Non-Profit Sector Survey Results

2.1 What qualities should job developers possess? (II.1)

(Results shown indicate a compilation of ranking orders 1, 2, 3 and those that checked three qualities rather than ranking them numerically)

1st: Self confidence

2nd: Knowledge of or prior experience in private business

3rd: Maturity

4th: Knowledge of the agency program

5th: Aggressive salesmanship and neat personal appearance

This is a good selection of attributes when viewed from business' point of view. The success of the job developer may relate to how closely he/she actually comes to meeting those attributes that are perceived to be important.

Interestingly, "strong client advocate" came in sixth as an important ingredient of success. Employers would probably agree with that ranking. They don't like the hard-sell and, in fact, a number of employers reported being threatened by job developers ("If you don't hire my client..."; "I demand to see your affirmative action plan..."). These tactics were notably unsuccessful in getting a client placed.

2.2 What training does a job developer receive? (II, 2, 3)

The most common type of training a job developer receives is an orientation by his or her immediate supervisor. On-going discussions at staff meetings ranked third. Although "formal training program internally presented" ranked second, this training tends to be procedural (how to use forms, program information, rules and regulations governing programs, how to write contracts, how to conduct client interviews).

Job developers receive minimal training relating to private business. As will be discussed shortly, this is the kind of training they need and request.

2.3 What kind of training and information would job developers like to have? (V.2)

This question was open-ended (no suggested answers were supplied). There was great similarity in the

responses, however, with the same areas being mentioned frequently.

Training needs requested: (in no priority order)

(1) Job development

- (a) how to create a job
- (b) how to identify hidden jobs
- (c) how to approach an employer
- (d) knowing your client - interviewing
- (e) importance of professional image and materials
- (f) time management

(2) Salesmanship techniques

- (a) "packaging" your program
- (b) telephone techniques
- (c) how to reach employers who have had a bad experience with program
- (d) persistence
- (e) communication

(3) Private sector

- (a) what business expects
- (b) profit making - cost-effective employees
- (c) role of personnel manager - what they do, likes and dislikes

(4) Labor market information

- (a) economic trends and local economy
- (b) how to analyze labor market information
- (c) what industries have what jobs

In addition to clear direction relating to training, a number of requests were received for specific information which job developers use in their work. Information needs included: Labor laws (minimum age, minimum wage, unemployment insurance, affirmative action requirements), apprenticeship, CETA overview, and the like.

2.4 How is information communicated to employers? (III 2, 3, 4, 5, IV 1, 2)

(1) Program communication

Employers learn about programs from two main sources (confirmed by employer response): verbal description by job developers and written information provided in person or by mail.

Job developers learn about programs first through staff meetings and from their supervisors and second, from written materials and training sessions.

(2) Source of written materials

Written informational material is generally prepared by the federal or state "parent" agency or developed by their own agency. Agency personnel rate its effectiveness as (1) "Good. Presents program well, but additional questions are usually asked" and (2) "Fair. Information presented is too simple or too complicated."

(3) Who makes contacts

Job developers were identified by respondents as those who were primarily responsible for contacting employers. Directors/agency heads and program managers ranked second and third respectively.

As to the nature of the contact, job developers rely on both personal visits and telephone contacts as the means to make their case to employers. Ranking second in this area were contacts with employers on committees, councils and the like.

(4) Agency view of role

One insight gained through personal interviews, but not asked on the questionnaire, is pertinent. Agency personnel generally have a narrow view of their role. Job developers, as the questionnaire indicates, make most of the employer contacts and other kinds of contact are limited. Speaking engagements, involvement in civic activities, and participation in Chambers of Commerce and other business organizations is minimal, and not seen as part of their jobs. Personal contacts with employers through various means all help establish a sense of confidence and trust. Where these contacts exist they are effective, but they don't exist at all.

Agency personnel generally are client and agency directed; they don't view themselves as major movers in the world of business. Some have described themselves as "keeping a low profile," "county employees," as "never having had a 'real' job," "speaking to organizations only if we're asked."

Community involvement should be viewed as another way of "selling" their programs. Some time should be made to pursue various civic activities which put placement staff in contact with employers in a neutral setting. One job developer established a very productive source of jobs by participation in such activity and, in fact, viewed community participation as part of his job.

If it is true that many employers view federal programs with a great deal of skepticism, it will help if they get to know representatives of placement programs in various and neutral settings.

2.5 Are job development activities coordinated? (IV 3, 10)

Agency responses indicate that they do coordinate their activities with other similar activities in the community. Some added that they do so informally. Personal conversations during many of these interviews suggested that the coordination is minimal. Very few real coordination efforts have been undertaken and those that have been were difficult to get underway.

Where some coordination exists, placement staff feel it is very valuable. From the agency point of view it provides them additional resources and enhances their services. For the client, coordination of resources makes the agency staff able individually to tailor an assistance program and increase the likelihood of finding employment for the client.

As for internal agency coordination, most job developers are on their own to "hustle" job openings and to work with employers. Very few are restrained, directed, or assisted by any coordination, either internal or external.

2.6 How does the job developer relate to the employer in regard to the client? (IV 4, 5, 6, 7, 8)

(1) Placement Criteria

The main criteria which agencies apply in the attempt to match a client with a job opening are, first, applicant expression of interest; second, previous similar job experience; and third, training related to job. Not surprisingly, many report that they try to match

interest with previous experience. But this can cause problems. Sometimes clients do not want to pursue the job for which they have training. One client reported that she had hidden the fact that she was a trained nurse because she didn't want to do that anymore! This highlights one of the problems that is translated into poor screening by the employer.

(2) Follow-up

Once a client has been referred to a job, follow-up activity varies greatly. Often some follow-up is maintained with the client, and a prescribed follow-up is maintained with the employer. Follow-up which is aimed at solving any problems that may have arisen is viewed, generally, very positively by the employer. Although some employers want to be left alone once a person has been hired, feeling that the issues are now between employer and employee, most employers expressed appreciation for good follow-up and noted its absence when it did not occur.

(3) Employer concerns

Although most agencies reported that employers' attitudes toward employing their clients are good to very good, they noted a number of recurring problems raised by employers. The most frequently reported problem was that employers were concerned about the quality of the applicants referred by the agency. The second most often reported employer complaint was concern over paperwork and red tape. Third, they reported employers raised the issue of the length of time a person remained on the job once placed.

SECTION IV

GENERAL DISCUSSION

This section expands on issues raised in the survey. A number of these issues will provide thematic material for the public information and training activities. Other issues are beyond the scope of the Private Sector Involvement Project, but may be addressed by private or public sector representatives as they continue to move toward more effective working relationships.

Discussion will address general perceptions and misperceptions of both private employers and public agency personnel. These conclusions are based on survey results, but also rely heavily on extensive numbers of conversations which helped to turn survey questions into "real life" situations and were invaluable in expanding on topics raised by the questionnaire.

Two kinds of issues will be presented in this section:

1. Common issues on which both public and private sectors agree.

2. Sector issues which are particular to private employers or to agency personnel. These represent disagreement or misperceptions.

A. COMMON ISSUES

1. Paperwork and Red Tape

Both sectors would agree that government programs entail considerable, often burdensome, paperwork and complicated rules and regulations. One prime sponsor gestured wearily to a huge stack of books which contained instructions about the programs he is administering. Another said he had not yet received instructions for a program that had been in place for six months. He reported that he got conflicting advice when he called Washington for clarification.

Although employers view the paperwork as a real disincentive to become involved with government programs, agencies view it as a necessary evil. Both would agree that it is onerous.

2. Value of Good Information

Both employers and agency personnel need and appreciate good, professional, clear, informative written materials about programs. Job Developers need good materials to "sell" their program and employers are impressed by clear written information as a means to learn about programs. In addition, agency people are frequently called on for other labor information. As one said, "Employers see that we are involved with one federal program and assume we know all relevant information about all federal programs."

A number of responses raised issues regarding information. The first and most obvious is "Who or where should I call for information?" The CETA system is not really accessible to the private

employer. There is no person at the other end of the phone line at the prime sponsor's offices who is trained to provide help to the employer calling for information. Even in King/Snohomish Manpower Consortium, the largest CETA prime sponsor and, therefore, the one with the largest administrative staff, there is no one staff person to handle requests for information from employers. These calls are sometimes directed to the public information officer who handles them as best he can. One employer, who did not get referred to the public information officer, called and got "a total run-around" because no one had the general information she was seeking or knew where to direct her for more information.

As CETA attempts to work more closely with the private business community, this need must be addressed. One phone number should be publicized and the person/people who answer that number must be trained to handle calls well with appropriate information, and good follow-up.

Another issue regarding information concerns numbers of programs and how confusing they are. Title II B may be different from Title II D may be different from Title VI but is all confusing as far as the layperson is concerned. As one CETA administrator remarked with insight, (and apologetically), "Each part of CETA is clear, makes sense and has a particular goal. Too bad no one has put it together so it can be understood."

Every program (and there are many) seems to serve everyone and in much the same way. The subtle difference between Targeted Jobs Tax Credit and WIN/Welfare Tax Credit may interest the administrator, but overwhelm the employer.

A third issue regarding information is "How much is the right amount?" Some employers want a quick summary and knowledge of where to turn if they want to pursue it. Some employers want detail so that when they finally get around to reading about the program they have sufficient information to make a decision. A related issue concerns how much information about public resources one wants to provide. The programs are numerous and, at some point, federal overkill might be perceived.

These are some of the problems that underlie Phases II and III of the Private Sector Involvement Project.

3. Applicant Success

Both sectors have a strong interest in an unemployed person successfully getting a job with the employer. The employer fills a vacancy, the job developer records a successful placement, the unemployed person becomes employed. Both job developer and employer resent it when a referred applicant does not keep an interview. And both are keenly aware of how few skills many applicants possess and how little job readiness they exhibit.

4. Training

Both employers and job developers pretty much agree on the kinds

of training which would be helpful to assist placement agency staff work more effectively. They agree that more knowledge of the workings of private industry would be helpful as well as improved presentation techniques.

5. Concern About Unemployment

Concern about unemployment and the importance of full employment certainly is a common theme. And, to some extent, both private and public sector representatives realize that each is playing an important role in addressing that issue. Sympathetic employers realize that disadvantaged social service agencies can help in this area. Agency staff are pleased when a client gets a job which helps relieve the client of that worry, which is usually only one of many problems.

6. Personal Contacts

Employers appreciate it when a job developer gets to know him or her and develops an understanding of his business needs. Good job developers also know that maintaining a good working relationship with specific industry people is essential. Both stress the importance of honesty in these relationships. One employer put it vividly, "It is important to really get to know the agency and staff to get beyond the 'skies are blue, water is beautiful' postcard image that is first presented." And a job developer noted, "my neck is on the block every time a client I refer goes for an interview."

In addition, more diverse contacts in a variety of settings could improve professional relationships. Everyone feels most comfortable with peers, and employers and agency personnel are no exception. Employers and placement staff should have contacts with each other in settings "away from the office" so they begin to think of each other as peers in some settings.

Several experiences which were reported during the interviews illustrate the problem and some ideas for improvement.

In one interesting discussion, a job developer who had just joined the Chamber of Commerce and attended her first meeting, reported that she had felt very out-of-place. She said she didn't feel she "spoke the language". One can imagine that she would not attend often unless a business-person met her halfway. She represents a minority agency and good opportunities for additional placement contacts - a loss for the employer, the clients, and for her - could be lost because of insufficient communication.

An employer who had expanded her methods of communication suggested:

> "First we must get the unemployed into the Employment Security Offices. I talk to several people every day who don't even know about the services of ES. I think we should run an ad in

6. Personal Contacts continued

> the paper letting people know the state provides free job-finding services for them. This way they wouldn't turn to private agencies or just go from office to office filling out applications. I was asked to speak at my local Job Service Center and I think this was excellent. They now know what we look for and placement results have improved drastically."

Another sympathetic employer proposed "a periodic meeting of employers and agencies' representatives so the needs and changing requirements of each can be aligned. Needs change constantly and the agencies have absolutely no way to get ahead of us."

Responsibility for solving the problem of limited contacts rests with both employers and agency staff and directors. Employers can be made more aware of the importance to them of helping placement staff move more comfortably in various business settings. Agency personnel need support and encouragement to view their jobs less defensively and more broadly.

Improvement is needed in the area of personal contacts both to increase the variety and level of contacts and to make job developer-employer contacts more effective.

7. Coordination

Some special attention should be given to the issue of coordination of job placement efforts. Employers rates coordination as the main improvement they would make to placement activities. Employers would really like a "one-stop shopping" system in which they call in one job description, deal with one person, and receive a variety of applicants. However, at the same time, many do not feel they see too many job developers. Some of the desire for coordination comes from employers' awareness that many different people are providing the same service for the same target population. They believe that the system would be more efficient, less expensive, and less duplicative if people worked together.

From the job developer's point of view, coordination is often seen as too time consuming (don't have time to do it) and antithetical to competition which is inherent in job developing. They are each out to make as many placements as possible themselves, using their own contacts with businesses. They fear coordination would require pooling of resources, sharing their special contacts, and giving away the secrets which make for their individual successes. Their own jobs are dependent on their producing so many successful placements.

Another aspect of the issue of coordination relates to the size and diversity of the problem of unemployment. There are many unemployed persons representing many different segments of the population. The many agencies which serve them also provide a variety of other necessary supportive social services which address problems other than employment. The number of agencies is not too many considering the

7. Coordination continued

numbers of people served. And those that have coordinated resources believe it to be helpful.

The value of coordinating placement activities lies in the fact that the goal of finding jobs for unemployed persons will be better met it job developers share information. The employer will be favorably impressed if agency X, who has no applicant to send, contacts agency Y who has a good prospect. The employer can be informed that both agency X and Y worked together to meet his/her need and both agencies will move up in the employer's esteem.

At the very least, coordination could be begun in a very non-threatening way. Employment Security would appear to be the obvious agency to take the lead in this effort, co-sponsored by the CETA prime sponsor. Job Developers in each community should have a regular time, as least once a month, when they meet together, discuss common problems, get to know each other, and learn how different agencies work and who they serve. This, as a first step, would start some informal coordination.

B. PRIVATE SECTOR ISSUES

This section will present a number of employment and placement issues from the employer's point of view. These represent comments and attitudes which were voiced frequently.

1. Dislike/Distrust of the Role of Government

a. Too Much Government Involvement:

There is a feeling that government is involved in every aspect of the employer's life and that government has too many and duplicative programs relating to employment.

b. Government Competition:

In many areas of the state, employers feel that they are competing with government for employees and on standards of pay, ranging from welfare payments ("they make more on welfare than they do if they are working") to Employment Security interviewers (highly paid by industry standards according to some employers) to Hanford employees. They resent supporting these activities, which they regard as in competition with their business, with their taxes.

c. No Accountability:

Many employers feel that government employees have no reason to be efficient, no incentive to do a good job, have no payroll to meet, and need not worry about making a profit — "no bottom line."

2. Concerns About Applicants

a. Applicant Disinterest:

Many applicants referred by agencies appear not to want a job. Employers reported they show up late for interviews, sometimes high on drugs, poorly dressed, with a poor attitude. If hired, they sometimes quit after a few days or demonstrated no interest in the job.

b. Lack of Applicants:

A common report was that employers had no response to listings at all which caused them to question the numbers of unemployed persons who were allegedly desperate for work. Since they do look to agencies serving minority clients for help in meeting affirmative action needs, they particularly noted this lack.

c. Poor Screening:

As reported earlier, employers almost universally reported that many applicants appeared for interviews with no skills related to the job advertised or often no knowledge of the job for which they were applying.

d. Job Readiness:

Over and over, we heard that employers want to hire someone who is ready to work. They are perfectly willing to do the necessary training if the person has a positive attitude, is willing to learn, and is reliable.

3. Procedural Concerns

Employers often complain about agency procedures and feel they are not well served by them. In addition to screening, they complain about the multiplicity of forms, the lack of attention to their job descriptions, the time it takes an agency to process the paperwork, and the lack of understanding of their business.

As one particularly glaring example of means (procedures) overwhelming the end (a person getting a job), an employer reported the following:

> Through a contact with an agency serving the handicapped, this employer had agreed to place a handicapped person on a job in a try-out basis. The employer had trained the handicapped person, had worked through some of the problems, and was extremely pleased. She felt the trainee was working out very well and wanted to hire her outright. The agency said "No, we don't want you to hire directly. We want to write an OJT contract with you because our funding is based on numbers of OJT contracts we negotiate."

3. Procedural Concerns continued

The story had a happy ending in that the person did get a job (but not with the employer).

Employers are very disturbed by this kind of example where perpetuating the system seems to be more important than producing results.

It is interesting to note in this regard, however, that those employers who understood agency procedures well (most notably, those who served on a JSIP committee) were much more sympathetic and enthusiastic. If they were aware of the numbers of job descriptions with which ES personnel worked, for example, they were more careful to work within that system. Again, this points to the need for better personal contact and involvement on both sides.

4. Incentive Programs

Although many employers have benefited from tax credits and training subsidies and have a positive attitude toward them, there are an equal number who expressed the following representative sentiments:

> "Financially they are of no benefit."
>
> "The applicants we get from these programs are too poor (in work ability)."
>
> "CETA is dealing with the bottom 15% and these people have many problems. Hiring them is not profitable."

C. PUBLIC SECTOR ISSUES

The issues presented here represent the agency point of view on topics which parallel employer comments.

1. Private Industry and Government Employment Programs

a. Affirmative Action:

Although employers with federal contracts have a legal obligation to comply with affirmative action requirements, job developers sometimes feel that they do the minimum. They feel that employers don't really want or intend to hire minority applicants; they just go through the motions to show they made an attempt to recruit such applicants.

b. "Employer Subsidy":

Some placement agency people feel that employers use OJT contracts as a source of "cheap labor," and then lay these employees off as soon as the contract ends. This looks bad on the applicant's resumé. The feeling was expressed that employers get all the benefits and have no obligation to retain the employee. Employers want hard work for almost no pay.

1. Private Industry and Government Employment Programs continued

c. Training:

In response to the employer's statement that they will handle the training, job developers state that employers are already doing their own training when they have OJT or STIP programs. Employers then have the responsibility to make sure these programs meet their needs.

2. Accountability

Although employers charge that public agency people are not accountable, placement staff feel they are accountable on every side — accountable to the Department of Labor, to prime sponsors, to their agency head and program manager, to the employer, and to the client. They are expected to master federal rules and regulations, (which change frequently), know each employer's particular needs, work through each client's problems, and meet their own placement goals. They admit that they play a "numbers game" but that is the way the system works.

3. Procedural Concerns

a. Forms:

One job developer put it eloquently when he said, "I am consumed by procedures." Job developers have to master complicated forms and have extensive reporting requirements. Rules and regulations change frequently.

b. Follow-up:

Employers appreciate good follow-up. Placement staff report that it is very time-consuming.

c. Job Descriptions:

Although employers complain that their job descriptions are ignored, job developers or interviewers report that they often deal with an employer who does not have a clear idea of what he/she wants. Placement staff have to help define the job.

d. Efficiency:

Public employment and training agency personnel are running a large and complex system. Efficiency, which is an agency goal, and personalized services, desired by the employer, do not always mesh.

e. Creativity:

Many job developers and other placement staff would like to approach parts of their jobs differently but never have the leisure to try out new ideas. There is also little internal reward for creative thinking.

SECTION V

RECOMMENDATIONS

The purposes of the survey described in this report were:

1. Assess public/private non-profit placement agency activities and relationships with private employers.

2. Assess communications and employers' familiarity with public employment programs.

3. Solicit suggestions for improvements and training.

The preceding report discusses findings from the survey in detail. In this section these findings will be translated into recommendations for action.

Two types of recommendations will be presented. The first set, outlined under heading A. below, will be specific actions and activities which will be undertaken to address some of the issues and problems identified in this report. These activities will be accomplished by Chandler/Corcoran as set forth in their contract. The other type of recommendations will fall into the category of "good ideas." These recommendations will be beyond the ability of Chandler/Corcoran to implement. If they are to be accepted, agency discussion and adoption at a policy level will be required.

A. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR PUBLIC INFORMATION CAMPAIGN AND TRAINING SESSIONS

Under the Private Sector Involvement Project contract, Chandler/Corcoran was retained to survey private employers and placement agency personnel to determine how to improve communication between the two sectors, and then, based on identified needs, provide information to employers about public employment incentive programs and assist job developers by helping them to improve their skills. Plans and recommendations for this public information campaign and for training sessions for job developers are presented in detail in the Phase II and III sections attached to this report and are presented in outline form here.

1. Training for Job Developers

   a. Identified Need:

      Job developers currently receive little or no training to prepare them to work within the private industry setting. Employers and job developers alike see the need for job developers to know more about private sector motivations and problems. Job developers wish to improve their knowledge of job development techniques and strategies and to become more effective communicators.

b. Recommended Action:

Training sessions will be held in four separate locations around the state with the goal of making job developers more effective in their jobs. The agenda will be prepared in conjunction with private employers, prime sponsors, placement agency staff, and other advisors.

2. General Public Information Campaign

a. Identified Need:

More than half of the employers interviewed have little or no familiarity with government employment incentive programs. This is particularly true of small (fewer than 100 employees) businesses.

b. Recommended Action:

A general information campaign will be implemented to raise employers' awareness of employment and training programs. Strategies will include public service announcements on television and radio, press conferences, multi-media feature stories, and local media contact.

3. Mid-level (Group) Communications

a. Identified Need:

Many employers have little or no familiarity with government employment and training programs. Among those that have some knowledge of these programs, there is a positive base of opinion on which to build. Employers gain their knowledge of incentive programs through written materials, job developer contacts, and professional associations. These programs are of particular interest to professionals who deal with them directly: personnel managers, auditors, accountants, and the like.

b. Recommended Action:

A film will be prepared which will increase understanding about the roles of employers and public/private non-profit placement agency personnel and provide program information. It can be presented by agency personnel at meetings of the Chamber of Commerce, Rotary, Grange, or other employee gatherings. A complementary brochure will be prepared to leave with the viewers. Letters and specific information will be directed to professionals who advise employers regarding use of particular programs. Mailings and newsletter articles will be sent for inclusion in professional publications.

4. Direct Employer Contact

a. Identified Need:

Employers learn about employment and training programs from job developer calls. Effective personal contacts are one of the best ways to "sell" the employer on use of these programs.

b. Recommended Action:

Following training of job developers, described above, to improve the quality of their employer contacts, they will be provided with more effective communication material. A professional desk-top flip chart will be developed which presents program information clearly and program descriptions in a brochure will be produced to leave with the employer.

B. GENERAL RECOMMENDATIONS ("GOOD IDEAS")

The following recommendations are felt to be beyond the scope of the Private Sector Involvement Project. They all would require agency discussion and acceptance at a policy level in order to implement. These recommendations combine employer suggestions and ideas which have evolved from Chandler/Corcoran discussion of problems described in this report. They are offered to encourage creative approaches to on-going public sector agency attempts to improve the effectiveness of their work.

1. Improved Community Awareness of Employment and Training Programs

a. Identified Need:

Many employers have a negative view of government programs. Personal contacts and positive communications are two of the most effective means of alleviating negative perceptions.

b. Recommended Actions:

(1) Develop more opportunities for public employment agency personnel to interact with employers through regularly scheduled meetings, open houses, no-host luncheons, etc.

(a) Encourage CETA and Employment Security directors and staff members to become more active in community and professional organizations.

(b) Encourage directors and other agency personnel to solicit speaking engagements with local organizations. Provide instructions and tools (such as film and brochures prepared by Chandler/Corcoran) to accomplish this.

(c) Develop format for and encourage job developer-employer workshops to increase understanding of each others' problems. JSIP committees or newly formed Private Industry Councils would be a logical starting place for this activity.

(2) Raise the visibility of public employment and training programs through implementing a local press strategy.

(a) Encourage agency directors to establish good working relationships with local editors, television or radio heads.

(b) Provide newspaper with regular individual success stories about clients.

(c) Provide newspaper with local business success stories (good public relations for business and highlights successful ES or CETA placement).

(d) Development a Business of the Month award to give credit to an employer who has been particularly helpful.

(e) Establish a habit of introducing important new agency personnel to the community through press releases or other means.

(3) Work with local Chamber of Commerce or other appropriate business organizations.

(a) Assign an agency person to work with the local Chamber of Commerce (or other organization where appropriate).

(b) Communicate positive things employers can/should do to make the placement relationship as helpful to them as possible. For example, employers can:

- give tour of their plant for job developers/interviewers
- voice complaints back to agency immediately when service has been unsatisfactory
- give credit and compliments to agency when service has been good

(c) Encourage Chamber of Commerce (or other organization) to sponsor a meeting to "train" job developers.

(d) Encourage Chamber of Commerce members to invite/sponsor job developers or other agency personnel for membership and stick by them for a couple of meetings to help them overcome feelings of being ill-at-ease.

(e) Encourage Chambers of Commerce to establish a committee on CETA/Employment Security employment programs within their committee structure.

2. Improved Agency Activities in Regard to Employers

a. Identified Needs:

Agency personnel have a narrow view of their role in the community. Staff need encouragement to coordinate activities more effectively and to explore new and creative ways to work with employers.

b. Recommended Actions:

(1) Raise sights of agency personnel regarding their role.

(a) Encourage discussion within the local agency of their internal role (client help, forms, procedures, etc.) and their external role as part of the total community employment effort, with increased emphasis on the latter.

(b) Raise internal morale by improved internal communications from agency directors, Dr. Wiegman, federal leadership, and supportive employers, i.e., let employees hear the good things that are said about the agency's performance.

(2) Coordinate job development efforts more effectively.

(a) Encourage Employment Security and CETA prime sponsors to take a leadership role in coordinating local job development activities.

(b) Establish regular job developer meetings.

(c) Make the meetings non-threatening. Meetings should focus on problem-sharing, getting to know each other, and "state of the art" talks.

(d) Develop a local list of agencies and services within the community and distribute it. Exchange phone numbers.

(e) Encourage agencies with the same clients to meet with each other on a regular basis.

(3) Enhance job development activities through creative approaches.

(a) Explore the possibility of employing a corps of local retired (or quasi-retired) executives to act as "door openers" and to provide practical feedback. They should be integrated as part of the placement team.

(b) Explore the possibility of an "exchange program" between public agency job developers and large company employee relations departments. For 6 months-12 months job developers/personnel staff

are rotated into counterpart assignments. This would be patterned after the United Way loaned executive model.

3. Improved Procedures to Serve Employer and Agency Personnel Better

a. Identified Need:

Agency personnel and employers are often ill-served by the procedures under which they function.

b. Recommended Actions:

(1) Consider development of one uniform contract which establishes a set of obligations for employer and agency. This contract would be re-negotiated annually, but various placement activities would be incorporated.

(2) Consider re-thinking agency activities from the bottom up.

This recommendation comes from the paper "Mapping Backward: Using Implementation Analysis to Structure Policy Decision" by Richard F. Elmore, Assistant Professor of Public Affairs, University of Washington. The thesis of this paper is that the most important activity goes on between job developer/interviewer, client, and employer. All other agency activities should be developed to support that activity and make it as effective as possible. This would require reanalysis and perhaps reallocation of resources. To quote from this paper (page 20):

"It becomes clear, when the delivery system is seen from the bottom, that a great deal of the effect of policy on individual preferences and choices depends upon the judgment, skill, and inventive ability of delivery-level personnel. There are a variety of specific things that delivery-level personnel can do to affect young people. (This paper was specifically directed to policy questions related to youth programs.) They can focus on basic cognitive skills, on vocational skills, on job-search skills, or on work experience. But the critical judgment comes in matching the treatment to the individual. There is no way that this judgment can be programmed by policy. The policy problem is not how to make delivery-level personnel behave consistently with some uniform set of standard operating procedures but how to maximize the likelihood that their judgments will increase the employability of young people...Policy decisions and organizational structures that can be directly connected with delivery-level transactions —that provide the resources necessary to complete those transactions — have a prima facie claim over those that don't."*

*"Mapping Backward: Using Implementation Analysis to Structure Policy Decision," by Richard F. Elmore, Graduate School of Public Affairs, Institute of Governmental Research, University of Washington. Published in Political Science Quarterly, Winter, 1979-80. This paper was prepared for the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, September, 1979, Washington, D.C. The author is Assistant Professor of Public Affairs and Assistant Director of the Institute of Governmental Research at the University of Washington.

Most of the recommendations in this section could be implemented for low or no cost. They would simply require agency personnel, in many cases, to strengthen and redirect activities that are currently underway; in other cases, to view their important role more broadly.

Increased effectiveness in working with private employers should result in getting more people who are unemployed employed in private sector jobs.

APPENDIX A - PRIVATE SECTOR SURVEY

CC✽I
chandler/corcoran inc.

CONFIDENTIAL

PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVEMENT PROJECT

Chandler/Corcoran, Inc., a private management consultant firm, is conducting this survey. It is part of a contract funded under the Governor's CETA Grant monies. The survey has two purposes:

1. To determine the effectiveness of relationships between private sector employers and public/private non-profit sector job developers.

2. To determine how and how much useful information about government employment incentive programs is disseminated to private employers.

CONFIDENTIAL - The information obtained in this survey is confidential and will not be identified by respondent or company, in any reports on the Project.

BACKGROUND ON COMPANY OR ORGANIZATION

NAME OF COMPANY/ORGANIZATION _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____ ZIP _____ TELEPHONE _____

CONTACT PERSON _____

TITLE _____

NUMBER OF EMPLOYEES 192,258

Number Union _____

Number Non-Union _____

CATEGORY:

	TOTAL
Manufacturing	99
General Business	46
Service	95
Agriculture or Forest Products	20
SPECIFIC PRODUCT OR SERVICE TOTAL:	260

DATE COMPLETED January 1, 1980

NOTES: (1) Numbers in parens () indicate number of employers responding to that question. Large on left; small on right.
(2) Left hand columns represent response of large employers (more than 100 employees) right hand columns represent response from small employers (less than 100 employees).
(3) Percentages are based on numbers of businesses responding to that question.
(4) Total surveys tabulated: 151 large/ 109 small.

CC*I
chandler/corcoran inc.
1625 Boylston Avenue Seattle WA 98122

CONFIDENTIAL

PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVEMENT PROJECT SURVEY

I. EMPLOYMENT PROFILE

1. Approximately how many new employees did your company or organization hire during the last twelve months? _____

2. Is your company a federal contractor observing affirmative action requirements and compliance audits? ____ yes; ____ no.

3. Check the sources you use to recruit job candidates? Rank the three used most frequently.

+100	-100		+100	-100	
69%	4 39%	a. Newspaper advertising	7 38%	7 26%	g. Educational institutions
10 16%	10 4%	b. Other publications	5 49%	5 34%	h. Private employment agencies
5 49%	3 41%	c. Your own employees	8 36%	9 22%	i. Private non-profit agencies
6 46%	6 30%	d. Word of mouth	3 65%	1 47%	j. Public agencies
4 61%	8 23%	e. Search of your applicant file	9 31%	9%	k. Executive search firms
2 68%	2 45%	f. Walk-in traffic	13%	9%	l. Other _____

II. PROFESSIONAL RELATIONSHIPS

If you deal with private non-profit agencies or public agencies to recruit job candidates, please complete this section. If not, go to section III.

1. With which public and private non-profit agencies in your community do you deal for job applicants? _____

_____

2. a. How many different job developers, approximately, do you see in a year from private non-profit agencies and public agencies? _____

(94/49) b. Do you consider that number 19%/4% too many; 38%/24% too few; 43%/71% about right.

In the following questions, please distinguish between public agencies and private non-profit agencies, if possible.

3. How do you rate the level of service received from representatives of public or private non-profit agencies? (Please consider the clarity of written material, the quality of the presentation, the competency of the representative, and the effectiveness of follow-up)

(80/27)	Private		Non-Profit		Public	(103/63)
(a) Very good. Almost always satisfied	1%		11%		17%	13%
(b) Adequate. Generally satisfied	58%		52%		40%	40%
(c) Poor. Seldom Satisfied	28%		30%		38%	41%
(d) Totally unacceptable	5%		7%		6%	6%

	Private Non-Profit		Public	
4. How would you rate the quality of applicants referred to you by private non-profit or public agencies?	(80 / 37)		(124 / 56)	
a. Well qualified and well screened	1%	0	1.6%	7%
b. Usually well qualified & well screened	26%	27%	27 %	27%
c. Occasionally well qualified & screened	59%	54%	57 %	55%
d. Neither qualified nor screened	14%	19%	14 %	29%
5. a. What is the frequency of your contact with these agencies?	(79 / 28)		(121 / 60)	
(1) Regularly (weekly or monthly)	54%	36%	50 %	33%
(2) Occasionally	46%	64%	51 %	67%
b. Who initiates the contact?	82 / 28			
(1) We usually initiate the contact	54%	61%	62 %	62%
(2) The agency usually contacts us	22%	25%	8 %	20%
(3) Both	24%	14%	30 %	18%
6. Which best describes your relationship with these agencies?	(80 / 34)		(114 / 58)	
a. I usually deal with the same person	44%	24%	31 %	19%
b. I deal with several people at the agency	21%	15%	31 %	26%
c. No pattern. I never know with whom I will be dealing	31%	44%	32 %	43%
d. I have no idea whom to contact	4%	18%	7 %	12%
7. Concerning the agency representative with whom you deal (e.g. job developers, counselors, their supervisors), how would you rate their knowledge and understanding of private sector employers?	(75 / 28)		(117 / 56)	
a. Very knowledgeable in all respects	9%	7%	9 %	7%
b. Fairly well informed, good attitude	43%	54%	50 %	48%
c. Little knowledge of private business	37%	32%	33 %	32%
d. Totally uninformed or seem to lack understanding of our needs	7%	7%	8 %	13%

III. COMMUNICATIONS

1. How familiar are you with the public incentive programs that are aimed at encouraging you to hire the unemployed? (e.g., OJT, Targeted Jobs Tax Credit, CETA training programs)

(127/47)

40% | 24%	a. I am very familiar with one or several of these programs	43% | 44%	b. I am somewhat familiar with them
15% | 27%	c. I am not very familiar with them	1.5% | 5%	d. I have no knowledge of them

CC*I
chandler/corcoran inc.
1625 Boylston Avenue Seattle WA 98122 (97/92)

2. Have you utilized any of these incentive programs? 51%/40% Yes; 49%/60% No.

3. If "Yes", which ones have you used?

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

d. _____

4. In your opinion, which ones have been useful to your company or organization? And why?

_____

_____

_____

(233/143)

5. If you have some knowledge about incentive programs, how did you gain it?

1 | 1 a. From written informational materials

5 | 3 b. From news media stories

2 | 2 c. From personal contact by job developer

3 | 2 d. From professional contacts

6 | 4 e. Word of mouth

4 | 5 f. Other _____

(112/88)

6. Is the information which you have, or to which you have easy access, sufficient to allow you to make a decision concerning the use of one of the incentive programs? 69% / 49% Yes; 31%/51% No.

(121/87)

7. How would you characterize the information you have received from the private non-profit or public agencies about incentive programs?

17% | 11% a. Very helpful and clear.

59% | 46% b. Generally helpful, but left some questions.

20% | 23% c. Inadequate to inform me. Unclear.

4% | 20% d. Of no value at all.

IV. GENERAL IMPRESSIONS OF PRIVATE NON-PROFIT/PUBLIC SECTOR AGENCIES

Regardless of whether you deal with private non-profit or public agencies in the recruiting and hiring of new employees, please give your opinion on these matters.

(132/84)

1. Concerning the general level of communications between the private non-profit/public sector and the private sector in your community, how would you characterize the present situation?

11% | 4% a. Very good. (Both sectors seem to appreciate the role & need of the other)

50% | 44% b. Generally satisfactory. (There are some misperceptions)

33% | 39% c. Generally unsatisfactory. (Communications are poor)

7% | 13% d. Very little or no understanding between them.

(151/110)

2. Concerning the efforts to place the unemployed in private sector jobs, the private non-profit and public agencies:

a. Should play a stronger role than they do now	(33%)	2	2	(20%)
b. Are performing the assignment satisfactorily	(14%)	3	4	(13%)
c. Should play much less of a role than they do now	(3%)	5	5	(2%)
d. Should get out of the placement business entirely	(8%)	4	3	(17%)
e. Should coordinate their efforts more effectively	(42%)	1	1	(38%)

3. What do you feel are the greatest needs to make the private non-profit and public agencies more effective in working with you? (Rank in order of priority)

(151/110)

	Order 1st Choice		Top Three All business
a. Upgrading of present personnel	1	4	2
b. Selection of different personnel	7	6	7
c. Better written information materials	4	3	4
d. Improved understanding of the role of a job developer	3	1	1
e. Better coordination with other agencies	2	3	3
f. Procedural and/or mechanical improvement	5	5	5
g. Better follow-up	7	3	6
h. Other _____	6	2	8

4. What other suggestions do you have for improving the quality and quantity of the placement of the unemployed in private sector jobs?

APPENDIX B - PUBLIC SECTOR SURVEY

Chandler/Corcoran Communications
1625 BOYLSTON AVENUE, SEATTLE, WA 98122 • (206) 323-9384

PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVEMENT PROJECT

Chandler/Corcoran, Inc. is conducting this survey. It is part of their contract funded under the CETA Governor's Grant monies. The survey has two purposes:

1. Determine the effectiveness of relationships between private sector employers and public/private non-profit sector job developers
2. Determine how and how much useful information about government employment incentive programs is disseminated to private employers

CONFIDENTIAL - The information obtained in this survey is confidential and will not be identified by respondent or organization.

BACKGROUND ON AGENCY OR ORGANIZATION

NAME OF AGENCY OR ORGANIZATION _____

ADDRESS _____

CITY _____ ZIP _____ TELEPHONE _____

PUBLIC SECTOR AGENCY _____ PRIVATE NON-PROFIT _____

CONTACT PERSON _____

TITLE _____

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF SERVICES _____

_____

PUBLIC SURVEY

109 Surveys tabulated

Chandler/Corcoran Communications
1625 BOYLSTON AVENUE, SEATTLE, WA 98122 • (206) 323-9384

PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVEMENT PROJECT SURVEY

I. AGENCY PROFILE

1. What target population(s) does your agency serve? (Check those appropriate)

35	a. Economically disadvantaged	28	f. Ex-offenders
36	b. Handicapped	23	g. Native American
29	c. Ethnic minority	31	h. Senior citizens
32	d. Youth	37	i. Migrant workers
36	e. Women	19	j. Other _____

2. What services does your agency provide to help clients find a job? (Check those appropriate)

1	(43)	a. Employs job developers who locate or create jobs in private sector
2	(32)	b. Employs job developers who locate or create jobs in public/ private non-profit sector
3	(23)	c. Administers programs which provide incentives to private employers to hire the unemployed person
5	(15)	d. Administers funds for programs which hire job developers
2	(32)	e. Provides support services to clients, including job training
4	(20)	f. Other (please describe) _____

_____

3. Approximately how many successful job placements were made through your agency last year? ("Successful" is defined as an employee who remains on the job for at least 90 days following initial placement, with one individual being counted once during a year)

___ a. In private sector jobs

___ b. In public sector jobs

___ c. In private non-profit agency jobs

II. JOB DEVELOPER PROFILE

If your agency does not employ job developers, go to section III.

1. Please indicate which qualities you consider most important for a job developer to be successful. (Rank in priority order with #1 indicating most important) (First three choices)

1	(35)	a. Self confidence	5	(15)	e. Aggressive salesmanship
5	(15)	b. Neat personal appearance	2	(25)	f. Knowledge of/prior experience in private business
6	(9)	c. Strong client advocate	7	(4)	g. CETA eligible
3	(19)	d. Maturity	4	(23)	h. Knowledge of your program

(First three choices)

2. Once a job developer has been hired, what training or orientation does he/she undergo? (Rank in priority order if more than one apply)

2 (14) a. Formal training program internally presented

6 (3) b. Formal training program run by another organization

1 (19) c. Orientation by immediate supervisor

3 (13) d. On-going staff meetings/ training sessions

4 (9) e. Peer training (e.g. site visits with another employee)

5 (4) f. Other _____

3. If your job developers undergo an initial training session, please indicate approximate length of training and list general topics covered:

a. Length of training: _____ hour(s) _____ week(s)
Varied from 1 day to 6 months _____ day(s) _____ month(s)

b. Topics covered in training session (by broad general heading):

_____ _____

_____ _____

4. Does your agency have standardized procedures for organization of a job developer's field time? ____ Yes; ____ No.

If "Yes," please indicate briefly what the procedures are:

_____

_____

5. Which of the following best describes the role of the job developer in your agency?

(2) a. Job developer is chiefly responsible for identifying job openings

2 (15) b. Job developer does intake, counselling, job placement, follow-up

1 (22) c. Job developer identifies job openings, does some placement follow-up

(4) d. Other _____

6. What is the average length of time a job developer remains in that assignment?
Two (2) years average length mentioned

III. COMMUNICATIONS

1. What programs or incentives available through your agency are designed to encourage the private employer to hire the unemployed person?

Name or type of program: Brief description

_____

_____

_____

Chandler/Corcoran Communications
1625 BOYLSTON AVENUE, SEATTLE, WA 98122 • (206) 323-9384

2. How do you communicate information about these incentive programs to the employer? (Check all that apply)

5 (5) a. Contract program out to another agency which "sells" it
2 (31) b. Job developer gives written material (e.g. brochure) to employer
1 (38) c. Job developer describes programs verbally to employer when appropriate
3 (21) d. Written material (brochure, bulletin, etc.) mailed to employers
4 (18) e. Programs are advertised in news media
If so, please indicate which: ____ radio ____ newspapers
____ television ____ trade publications

3. How do job developers learn about incentive programs which your agency administers?

3 (20) a. Part of their initial training program
1 (34) b. Discussion with supervisor and in staff meetings
2 (21) c. Written materials provided to them
4 (14) d. Training sessions with federal or state agency
4 (14) e. Discussions with peers in other programs
(2) f. Other _____

4. What is the source of written information regarding incentive programs?

1 (29) a. Material is prepared by federal or state agency
2 (18) b. Our agency develops our own descriptive material
3 (4) c. Understandable written information is not readily available
(4) d. Other _____

5. How would you rate the effectiveness of written material describing incentive programs which your agency uses?

4 (3) a. Excellent. Very effective in communicating necessary information.
1 (25) b. Good. Presents program well, but additional questions are usually asked.
2 (12) c. Fair. Information presented is too simple ___ or too complicated ___.
3 (6) d. Poor. Totally inadequate; don't use it.

IV. RELATIONSHIP WITH THE PRIVATE SECTOR

1. Who in your agency is primarily responsible for making contact with private sector employers?

2 (17) a. Director or agency head
3 (13) b. Program manager
1 (38) c. Job developers
4 (8) d. Other _____

(First three choices)

2. What is the most frequent kind of contact between your agency and the private sector employers? (Please rank in order of frequency)

4 (5) a. Director telephones company president/senior manager

2 (8) b. Director or other agency personnel sit with private employers on committees, councils, etc.

1 (25) c. Job developers contact personnel managers/company president:

____ in person; ____ by telephone

3 (6) d. Agency personnel participate in workshops, meetings, etc.

5 (4) e. Other _____

3. How do job developers choose businesses to contact? (Rank in priority order)
(First two choices)

1 (45) a. Each develops his/her own employer contacts.

2 (34) b. Supervisor coordinates and assigns businesses to specific job developer.

3 (22) c. Businesses initiate contact with agency

4 (8) d. Other _____

4. Once a job opening has been identified in the private sector, how many clients do you refer as applicants? _____
(First three choices)

5. What are the main criteria your job developers or counsellors use to match an applicant with a job opening? (Rank in priority order)

2 (34) a. Previous similar job experience

3 (29) b. Training related to job

1 (39) c. Applicant expression of interest

4 (5) d. Test performance

6 (1) e. Applicants taken in order of application

5 (3) f. Other _____

6. Once a client has been referred to a job, what follow-up activities occur?

		at regular intervals	as need arises	at least once
2 (19)	a. Contact is maintained with client			
1 (27)	b. Contact is maintained with employer			

(3) c. Client is on his/her own: no further agency involvement

____ d. Other

7. How would you rate private employers' attitudes toward employing your clients?

2 (13) a. Very good. Great deal of understanding and willingness to cooperate.

1 (24) b. Good. Some are sympathetic; some are not

3 (12) c. Fair. Employers are hard to convince.

(1) d. Poor. Generally unsympathetic and unwilling to hire.

(First three choices)

8. What questions or concerns are most frequently raised by private employers with whom you deal? (Please rank in order of frequency)

1 (39) a. Quality of applicant (training, attitude, reliability, etc.)
2 (25) b. Concern about paperwork and red tape
4 (8) c. Amount of time needed to process applicant into work force
3 (20) d. Length of time person remains on the job once placed
5 (5) e. Union-related issues
6 (4) f. Other _____

9. How do you gain information about job trends/employer needs in your community?

1 (31) a. Published reports from Employment Security ____; CETA prime sponsor ___.
3 (29) b. Newspaper articles
2 (30) c. Discussions with employers and organized labor representatives
4 (12) d. Other _____

10. Does your agency coordinate job development activities with other similar activities in your community? 6 Yes; 4 No.

V. FUTURE DIRECTIONS

1. What changes would you suggest to improve the relationship between public/private non-profit job developers and private sector employers?

2. What kind of additional information or training would be beneficial to you and your agency staff to assist you achieve your job placement goals?

Thank you very much. Please return completed survey to the address above.

APPENDIX C

Persons Interviewed in connection with the Private Sector Involvement Project:
(in addition to individuals surveyed)

Kass Anderton, Employment Security (National Alliance of Business)

Judy Ball, former head of PSE, King County

Dave Berg, Employment Security/CETA Director

Ruth Berg, Director of Training, Employment Security

Doug Bohlke, President, Association of Washington Business

Bruce Brennan, Assistant Superintendent Vocational Education, OSPI

Bob Brown, Director, OJT Program, Seattle Urban League

Diane Cotterell, President, Pacific Northwest Personnel Management Assoc.

Dennis Coplen, Executive Director, State Advisory Council on Vocational Education

Barbara Turner-DeAsis, Regional Coordinator, PSIP, National Alliance of Business

Robert Dilger, Executive Secretary, Washington State Building and Construction Trades Council

Paul Dziedzic, Executive Secretary, Governor's Committee on Employment of the Handicapped

Betty Emry, Project Director, The Partnership Project, Osoro & Associates

Joseph Garcia, Executive Director, Private Sector Initiatives

William Garvin, Governmental Affairs Counsel, Association of Washington Business

Walt Greenly, Washington Technical Institute

Bill Grinstein, CDS, KSMC Labor Market Survey

Jim Harrell, Area Representative, Human Resources Development Institute

Nancy Walton-House, Manpower Training Institute, Seattle University

Associate Professor Johny Johansson, School of Business Administration, University of Washington

Sue Kennedy, Department of Labor, Job Service Improvement Project

Larry Kenney, Director of Research, Washington State Labor Council

Gene Leonardson, Director of Continuing Education, Willamette University Salem, Oregon

Mary Ellen McCaffree, Director of the Office of Budget, King County

Don McCambridge, Director, Vocational Resource Center

John McKibbin, Clark County Commissioner

Dr. Kent Mathison, Superintendent, Ellensburg School District

Roger Merritt, National Alliance of Business, Seattle Metro Director

Arnold Parrott, Regional Chairman, Job Service Improvement Program

Persons Interviewed in connection with the PSIP (Page Two):

Ray Price, Department of Labor, Job Service Improvement Project
Robert Roberts, Superintendent, Renton Vocational Technical Institute
Dr. Michael Rosow, Work in America Institute, Inc., Scarsdale, New York
Roger Scott, Consolidated Employment Training Service, Tacoma
Gene Silverton, Director, DSHS Handicapped Vocational Training
Jack Slee, Employment Security
Dean Starr, Superintendent, Yakima School District
Barry Stern, CDS, KSMC Labor Market Survey
Graham Tollefson, Yakima County Commissioner
John Welsh, Public Information Office, Employment Security

CC✻I
chandler corcoran inc.

APPENDIX D

PRIVATE SECTOR INVOLVEMENT PROJECT

PHASES II AND III

NARRATIVE

During Phase I of this project we have conducted parallel surveys of private employers and public/private non-profit job placement agencies to assess their working relationships, methods of communications, effectiveness of communications, and needs for improvement. This extensive survey included three major interview techniques:

Personal	66	private employer interviews
	44	public/private non-profit agency
Mail	148	private employer
	32	public/private non-profit agency
Phone	46	private employer

In addition, some 35-40 "background" interviews have been conducted with people involved in some aspect of employment and training. These interviews have included representatives from various state agencies, labor representatives, Department of Labor personnel, National Alliance of Business, Job Service Center managers, Job Service Improvement Program members, various prime sponsor staff members, school district staff and superintendents, and others.

Based on these surveys and conversations, a preliminary summary of findings, presented below, has evolved and will be used to shape the activities of the public information campaign and the training for job developers. The findings will be described in detail in the Phase I report.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The findings presented here represent general and summarized conclusions, the bases for which are clearly contained in the survey results, but which also draw on the extensive number of conversations we have had with employers and placement agency staff on these issues.

A. Private Sector Employer Findings

1. Relationship with Job Development Activities

There is a somewhat positive base of opinion regarding public placement activities on which to build. However, there are many strong and vocal critics and much improvement is desirable.

2. Familiarity with Public Incentive Programs

More than half of the employers responding have little or no familiarity with government employment incentive programs. Those that have some knowledge gained it from written information, job developers and professional contacts (in that order).

3. Suggestions for Improvement

Employers want job developers to be better trained (more aware of business needs and more effective in carrying out their responsibilities); to be working in a more coordinated way with each other; and to be using better written information.

B. Public/Private Non-Profit Agency Findings

1. Job Developer Activities and Training

Job developers receive little or no formal training concerning the private sector, although they bear primary responsibility for these contacts. There is little effective coordination of their activities.

2. Communication with Employers

Written materials provided to employers are generally developed by the agency or its "parent" at the state or federal level. Agency personnel generally have a narrow view of their role in the community.

3. Suggestions for Improvement and Training

Placement agency staff want more understanding of the workings of private industry and training in communication techniques, job development, and labor market analysis. They would like more opportunities to communicate with employers.

To address these findings, the following activities for Phases II and III are planned:

OVERVIEW

A public information/training plan will be implemented which consists of four major sequential segments:

First:	Job Developer training
Second:	General public information campaign
Third:	Mid-level (group) communications
Fourth:	Direct employer contact

Each segment is interrelated and a consistent theme, developed in concert with the Employment and Training Division, will be carried throughout the program.

Informational material will be directed to both rural and urban audiences.

Phases II and III - Detailed Work Plan

I. Training for Job Developers

A. Goal

Improve the effectiveness of job developers in working with private employers to increase the number of unemployed people placed in private sector jobs.

B. Objective

Plan and carry out four training sessions for job developers in four locations around the state in January - February 1980.

C. Strategies

1. Choose four locations (with the advice of Employment and Training Division of Employment Security).
2. Identify, convene, and work with an Advisory Committee made up of private employers, job developers, prime sponsor representatives, and labor representatives to plan content of training based on identified need.
3. Identify and engage necessary personnel to participate in training sessions.
4. Produce necessary materials for distribution and presentation at sessions, including a film (see below, Section III).
5. Attend to specific meeting details and arrangements.
6. If feasible, video-tape sessions or portions of sessions for future use.

II. General Public Information Campaign

A. Goal

Raise the general public's, but most specifically employers' awareness of employment and training programs.

B. Objective

Plan, prepare and set in motion a variety of public information strategies to be implemented statewide in February - March 1980.

C. Strategies

1. Prepare news releases and plan news conferences, as deemed appropriate, for Governor Ray, Dr. Wiegman, and CETA prime sponsors.
2. Prepare feature stories for inclusion in newspaper, magazines, and broadcast media.
3. Prepare instructions for local CETA and Employment Security offices to encourage editorial contacts with local media.
4. Produce television public service announcements.
5. Write and release radio public service announcements.

III. Mid Level (Group) Communications

A. Goal

Increase knowledge and understanding about public employment, training, and incentive programs among groups of employers and professionals.

B. Objective

Plan, prepare and set in motion a variety of information strategies directed to groups of private employers and specific professions which

assist employers. To be implemented Spring 1980.

C. Strategies

1. Produce a film that will increase understanding of the roles and responsibilities of public and private sectors and provide information about public programs designed to encourage the private employer to hire the unemployed person.
2. Produce brochures which complement the film.
3. Devise strategies and make contacts with CETA prime sponsors and others which will encourage their using the film and brochures for public presentations.
4. Prepare cover letter and specific information about tax credits and incentive programs to be mailed to specific professional groups, such as CPA's, auditors, and personnel managers.
5. Prepare mailings or newsletter articles for specific professional organizations such as Association of Washington Business, Chambers of Commerce, and other professional associations to inform them about and highlight public incentive programs.

IV. Direct Employer Contact

A. Goal

To increase number of placements of unemployed persons in private sector jobs.

B. Objective

Carry out training of job developers described in Section I above and plan, prepare, and provide to job developers improved communication material concerning incentive programs. To be implemented Spring 1980.

C. Strategies

1. Provide training as described above.
2. Produce a desk-top flip chart for use by job developers in describing incentive programs to employers.
3. Prepare and provide complementary brochures to leave with employers describing programs contained in the desk-top flip chart and instructing them where to turn for more information.

V. Preparation of Final Report and Program Inventory

A. Goal

Provide Employment and Training Division of Employment Security with complete information from Private Sector Involvement Project.

B. Objective

By March 8, 1980, prepare and produce full report of all phases of the project and an inventory of employment, training and incentive programs.

C. Strategies

1. Prepare and analyze final survey results from Phase I.
2. Prepare description and analyses of activities of Phases II and III.
3. Prepare inventory of employment, training, and incentive programs in a form that is usable and expandable.
4. Mail survey summary to all participants.

APPENDIX E

EMPLOYER COMMENTS

While the report contains a number of significant statistical analyses, the personal interviews and mailed responses provided an opportunity for employers to "speak their piece" in general. The following quotes are presented for the interest and instruction of the reader, as well as a way to give a flesh-and-blood dimension to the study.

None of the respondees are identified by name or company -- a condition promised at the outset to encourage candor. However, the collective wisdom of the responses can be extremely helpful to those who are striving to improve employment placement activities in the state.

Following are representative samplings of employer responses:

I. Predictably a number of employers took the opportunity to lash out at what they see as a growing intrusion by government in their business.

> "Government is trying to dominate," said one. "It should quit trying to do the activities that the private sector can do better...Government agencies should confine their efforts to problem areas, to people who cannot be accomo-ated by the private sector."
>
> Another said: "Let us (private employers) provide the jobs. We are inventive and generally meet our needs with adequate personnel...Stop trying to help us. Let us make profits and we'll employ the people..."
>
> The theme continued with only slight variations around the state: "The private employment agencies are better equipped, more flexible, have more incentive, better contacts, and are more capable of placing unemployed persons than public agencies."
>
> "Let private industry do the training itself. Government should concentrate on making jobs more meaningful and welfare less attractive."

"Organizations, who, like ourselves, generally feel that training is part and parcel of doing business are browbeaten into accepting money for training referrals (purposes). Why not save on tax dollars and let us do what we do for free now?"

Some expanded on this feeling of self-sufficiency in the private sector, but with interesting variations. Said one: "Private non-profit and public agencies should provide training only. Training should be in a closed workshop situation. When an individual has obtained basic skills and is job ready (i.e., in terms of attendance and attitude as well as skills), a private-for-profit firm should be used for placement. Payment for placement would be made to the private firm if the individual is still successfully employed at the end of six months unless there have been mitigating circumstances..."

And an occasional private employer was painfully direct: "They (the public agencies) are only interested in maintaining the status quo in their area. They're afraid of losing their jobs. I don't trust the ..... They are not interested in my problems."

II. On the other hand, there are private employers -- especially smaller firms -- who are crying for help from any source. This has not been forthcoming according to some.

Said one: "I've been extremely frustrated by the repeated lack of interest of job developers in most of the agencies. Several told me they generally work with larger companies. Our company (a smaller one with fewer than 100 employees) would welcome help in getting qualified affirmative action candidates."

Another: "Big companies get all the attention. They (the public employment agencies) should try contacting the smaller companies.

"With one exception, I've been unable to get a single referral from the many tax-supported agencies with whom I list <u>every</u> job opening..."

A Director of Personnel in a small company had this to say about her dilemma: "I would <u>like</u> to be called on by job developers to learn what resources (for employees) are available to me. I don't have a complete idea at the present time."

This non-polarized audience -- one ready to give the public and private non-profit sector an opportunity to perform -- is substantial. Many personnel managers, it should be noted, are relatively new in their jobs and they are looking for the kind of assistance that competent job placement activities can provide.

III. Finally, the vast majority of the business representatives interviewed accepted the need for public and private non-profit job placement agencies and sought to offer constructive criticism to them. These comments, when grouped in this Appendix, may sound like a tattoo of criticism. It should be kept in mind that they were offered in a context that often acknowledged good performance by some segments of the public and private non-profit agency sector.

There was heavy emphasis on better screening:

> "Screening is the most important improvement Job Service could make. I realize they are trying to do the most good for the most people, but this effort would be greatly worth making. They should try to develop a standardized format for job requirements (skills, experience, training) and screen applicants against the employers' listing of those standardized requirements. Nothing would raise the stature of the Job Service in the eyes of employers more than the referral of qualified applicants."

> "Too often I feel individuals are being pushed at me as a candidate when there is no way the individual is employable, i.e., they do not exhibit any initiative to have a job (for whatever reason) and they have no idea or interest in what the job is that is available."

> In a joint interview with two personnel managers, these critical needs were stressed:

> (1)More screening and testing of applicants prior to their site visit.

> (2)Better training programs for people doing the referrals.

> (3)Better informational materials.

> "Applicants who showed up were unprepared to commit to going to work. Often they were late or simply showed up

to appear that they were interested. They only want to be counted, but are not really employable."

"There simply must be a better quality of applicants to send to the employer. Applicants do not keep appointments, are poorly dressed, are obviously not interested in the job or maybe in not working at all..."

"There seems to be a dearth of applicants (at the present time) in the office, professional, technical, and semi-professional areas..."

"(Public agencies) seem not to know or care about company's needs. Precise job descriptions and instructions are not followed."

"My major complaint is that I put in the time to place a clear, specific job order and nine out of ten of the agency people don't read it, judging from the follow-through. Also, they always promise follow-up, but seldom do."

"Professional openings should be handled with an advance resume' of the applicant. Often, they (placement agencies) call with the person at the desk wanting to send him or her right out for an interview."

Perhaps summing up all responses in this category was this one: "We expect and need pre-screened applicants. The specific qualifications listed on our job orders must be utilized. If they (placement agencies) have questions, they should ask them."

Some private businesspeople went to great lengths in preparing their responses to the questionnaire and this one -- from the president of a company -- was one of the most complete and potentially instructive:

"I considered, and was willing to hire, WIN, CETA, and Work Release (NAB) persons to meet job openings last year. After reviewing the paperwork requirements I hired two people directly and did not use the programs. I found the paperwork cost far outweighed the wage-sharing benefits of the programs.

"Re: Job Developers -- I found the caliber and knowledge of several persons I have dealt with was not adequate to select the semi-skilled and skilled people I needed.

"I offer these suggestions for improvement:

"A. Reduce the incentive to be unemployed -- My employees and I have recently discussed at least ten individuals by name who work just long enough to qualify for unemployment benefits, then leave and collect the benefits until they must return to work. We resent this form of income redistribution through our taxes.

"B. Both private and public placement groups must prepare and screen their proposed candidates better. I interviewed eight WIN and/or CETA candidates for a new position this past year. None of them approached the written requirements which I had supplied to the job counselors involved. Two of the candidates expressed their opinion that they were being 'shuffled' from appointment to appointment without knowing if their skills would match the job requirements. I was also concerned that the counselor did little to help the candidates prepare themselves in appearance and attitude for the interview. Hence, I felt my time was wasted meeting these unscreened, unprepared candidates. A small businessman cannot afford this loss of time.

"I readily found an outstanding candidate by word of mouth within days of my decision to cease dealing with the agency counselors. That person I subsequently hired and has now completed one year with our firm and is a strong asset to the organization."

Another: "They (placement representatives) should be here when we do the interviewing. Some applicants come in higher than a kite."

"Agency personnel need to have a better understanding of what 'standard' jobs entail. They are usually helpful when an opening is listed, but often you never hear from them again. This is one reason why private employment agencies are gaining such a stronghold over non-profit and public agencies -- they at least refer technically-qualified applicants."

There was a continual stressing of the need for better communications between employers and placement agencies, with the private business representatives indicating, in many cases, a willingness to seek improvements in this critical area. Typical comments:

"Job developers should visit the company and go on a tour and learn about the type of jobs the company recruits for in most cases..."

"There should be general meetings between employment placement agencies and employers to explain the programs and to allow the employers to discuss their needs."

"It appears that many of the programs could be consolidated, particularly those that are publicly funded."

"More industry people should be ACTIVELY involved on the boards (and advisory boards) of private non-profit agencies..."

"Because of the turnover in the private non-profit area, it is difficult to keep communication fresh. We seem to have to start building rapport and understanding all over due to new personnel."

A number of the respondees called for exchange meetings -- at both employer and agency sites -- to foster better understanding and face-to-face communications.

"We need to talk through our dilemma -- industry trying to be specific about a job requirement versus an agency trying to find a job for a specific person."

Incentive programs also came in for comment by numerous private sector representatives. For most, the quality of the employee is far more important than any slight financial advantage they realize through an employment subsidy. A few said:

"I don't really care about the subsidy. I'll pay the cost myself if we get a good employee."

"My accountant points out the tax credit, but if an employee is a good employee it (the subsidy) is fine, but this is not the important thing."

One: "We don't need incentive programs. The applicants they bring are too poor (in terms of quality)."

Here are random samplings of responses from one group meeting of employer representatives, which included personnel, employee relations, industrial relations and/or employment managers, director, or vice presidents.

"Elimination of 'order control' and a return to personal contact between employer and placement interviewer. More training of placement personnel in understanding and dealing with private sector employers. Better coordination with private non-profit placement agencies."

"Private non-profit agencies -- more training for placement personnel especially in the area of career counseling. Better coordination with state agencies."

"I'm very disappointed! This survey seems to deal only with communicating the services rather than the desperate need to improve the product -- the training and motivation and selection of placement of the unemployed. If the (product) latter were done, the marketing would be a relatively simple matter. We have developed and successfully implemented such a 'product' improvement program."

"All of the agencies I have dealt with have little or no capability of recruiting technical personnel, either exempt or non-exempt. The people I've dealt with don't understand the difference, for example, between an electrical, mechanical, architectural draftsperson. I have invited representatives of different agencies, both public and private non-profit, to our plant so that they can have a better understanding of our business, but rarely deal again with the same people (representatives) at the agency."

Finally, there were many one-liners that may provide a kernel of an idea for improvement in the placement efforts of public and private non-profit agencies. Included were these:

"Minority agencies should do more advertising with own client community to provide more applicants. There is a tremendous amount of overlap -- same target populations, different job developers."

"One-stop shopping would be ideal. I have to call each opening to seven or eight agencies and describe the job to each."

"Public sector representatives have often had no business experience. They don't understand that business must make a profit..."

"CETA is dealing with the bottom 15%, with many and various problems. They are not profitable..."

"When an applicant (once hired) does not come to work, the job developer should come in for them."

"(Agency people) should have previous business experience, not (be) social workers."

"The state should coordinate all jobs."

"CETA training is a good program. It's better than nothing."

"Follow-up should be for the benefit of the agency, not the employer. It's a checkup on how the agency is doing its job."

"There is really little communications with business by the public and private non-profit sector. Check the meeting schedule of the agency. Who are they meeting with? Their peers in most cases."

"The employer must spend some time talking to the people (from the agencies). Invite them to the plant. Say what is good or bad."

"We haven't been able to hold WIN employees beyond two months. The actual program value is not possible to determine."

"Paperwork! Paperwork! Paperwork!"

There were many more responses, but these may give a flavor of the concern and content. Clearly, employers have opinions about the job placement activities that are underway in the state of Washington and, despite moments of frustration and disenchantment, they are generally committed to working with the agencies to improve the performance in this critical area of our society.

APPENDIX F

IN SUMMARY*

National Alliance of Business

There appear to be few barriers hindering the potential future success of PSIP. The national business community may be considered "virgin territory" for a comprehensive marketing and communications program designed to place disadvantaged workers in well-paying, entry-level or second-level jobs.

The Private Industry Council should be viewed as the keystone of the entire PSIP program. Without PIC, the concept becomes "just one more government manpower program." Membership in a PIC should be openly and widely available to both men and women executives. Exclusionary political-type appointments ought to be avoided.

A "cafeteria" approach appears most suitable to explain and sell PSIP at the local level. Business people should be able to select the particular benefits of greatest interest to them and learn more about these benefits through rifle-shot communications and one-on-one personal contacts. The entire PSIP program is virtually indigestable at one sitting, and the acronym itself appears likely to remain a permanent mystery.

The NAB seems particularly well qualified to furnish technical assistance for PSIP among the nation's larger business firms, where NAB is well known and highly regarded. Among smaller firms, the Chamber of Commerce would appear to be a good choice, without ruling out the participation of other organizations having specific strengths.

CETA is not a dirty word among business executives, and there seems no need to avoid mentioning that training funds and equal participation with business in PIC's will be under CETA sponsorship. The realization that business people will participate in PSIP from inception through delivery should be adequate (if all promises are kept) to set aside misgivings about CETA.

*A Survey of Executives on their Reactions to the New Private Sector Initiative Program, A report prepared for Fraser/Associates and the National Alliance of Business by Opinion Research Corporation, Princeton, NJ, May 1979 (ORC Study #64082).

APPENDIX G

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS*

Chamber of Commerce of US

- Three-fourths of the employers surveyed do not use CETA; 29% do not use the Employment Service; 38% do not use Private Employment Agencies. While the survey is not specific on reasons for this, the results lend credence to the following conclusions:
  - CETA
    A. CETA programs are targeted toward economically disadvantaged and unemployed persons -- a group where industry demands are generally low because of their low skill level. If CETA is to serve more employers and increase its service to clients, greater emphasis must be placed on employers needs and how these needs can be filled by CETA clients.
    B. CETA programs -- by legislative design -- are concentrated in central cities where unemployment is high; however, it is the rural and sunbelt regions which are experiencing economic growth and thus, have the greatest job growth. Solving this disparity would probably increase employer use of CETA programs.
    C. CETA is a relatively new program which has placed little emphasis on linkages with the private sector; since the private sector provides 80% of the jobs in the nation's economy, CETA should work to increase employers' use of its programs. This should not be too difficult in light of the favorable impression of employers who have used CETA programs.
  - ES
    Despite the fact that ES has a greater penetration into the employer community than does CETA, it still suffers from intense criticism from private employers. Dissatisfaction is voiced about the quality of referrals, workers' job performance and motivation, and the number of applicants from ES. Unless these criticisms can be overcome, there appears little chance to expect increased penetration into the employer community.
  - PEA
    While frequency of use is about the same for the ES and PEA, the survey shows a much higher degree of satisfaction with services provided by PEA.
- Of those businesses who have used CETA and ES, generally there was greater satisfaction with CETA. Survey responses seem to indicate that this may be because employers expect less from CETA clients, use CETA to fill positions which are unskilled and have frequent turnover, and they use CETA by deliberate choice.

- The business community sees usefulness in government employment and training programs, particularly those which provide literacy and general orientation and counseling to prepare people for the world of work. This seems to indicate that 1) employers see motivation and general work attitudes as key factors in who they hire and 2) employers are willing to provide specific skills training themselves but they do not see themselves as providers of basic literacy and work attitudes which have traditionally been a part of the education process.

*A Survey of Federal Employment and Training Programs, National Chamber Forecast and Survey Center, Chamber of Commerce of the United States, 1615 H St, NW, Washington DC 20062, September 1978.